

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT TACOMA

8 THOMAS and DEANNA FIELD,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 STATE FARM MUTUAL
12 AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE
13 COMPANY,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C13-5267 BHS

ORDER GRANTING IN PART
AND DENYING IN PART
PLAINTIFFS' DISCOVERY
MOTION

15 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs Thomas and Deanna Field's
16 ("Fields") motion for relief from discovery deadline and for additional discovery (Dkt.
17 23). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of and in opposition to the
18 motion and the remainder of the file and hereby grants in part and denies in part the
19 motion for the reasons stated herein.

20 **I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

21 On October 10, 2012, the Court issued a scheduling order setting the discovery
22 completion deadline as June 9, 2014. Dkt. 10. On August 7, 2014, the Fields filed the

1 instant motion requesting relief from that deadline and additional discovery. Dkt. 23. On
2 August 13, 2014, Defendant State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company (“State
3 Farm”) responded. Dkt. 26. On August 15, 2014, the Fields replied. Dkt. 28.

4 II. DISCUSSION

5 In this case, State Farm argues that the Fields’ requested discovery will interfere
6 with upcoming deadlines, the Fields have not been diligent in pursuing this discovery,
7 and the requested claim files are irrelevant. Dkt. 26. The Court agrees with State Farm
8 only on the issue of relevance because the Fields have failed to show the relevance of
9 other claim files on the actual claims asserted in this case. Therefore, the Court denies
10 the Fields’ motion as to other claim files.

11 With regard to State Farm’s claims manual, the Court finds no risk of interference
12 with deadlines or a lack of diligence. State Farm should be able to produce the manual
13 immediately. Moreover, the Fields have filed the current motion shortly after the
14 deposition in which they discovered its existence. While the Court appreciates State
15 Farm’s argument that in the exercise of reasonable diligence the claims manual should
16 have been requested in discovery sooner, the Court can find no material prejudice to State
17 Farm by producing the manual. Therefore, the Court grants the Fields’ motion as to the
18 claims manual.

19 III. ORDER

20 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Fields’ motion for relief from
21 discovery deadline and for additional discovery (Dkt. 23) is **GRANTED in part** and
22

1 **DENIED in part** as set forth herein. State Farm shall produce the manual as soon as
2 possible, and in no event later than August 27, 2014.

3 Dated this 20th day of August, 2014.

4
5 

6 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22